



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|

09/973,224

10/09/2001

Gunter Krautkramer

WEB 0035 1A

7431

7590

07/09/2004

Killworth, Gottman, Hagan & Schaeff, L.L.P.

Suite 500

One Dayton Centre

Dayton, OH 45402-2023

EXAMINER

ELOSHWAY, NIKI MARINA

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3727

DATE MAILED: 07/09/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/973,224

Applicant(s)

KRAUTKRAMER, GUNTER

Examiner

Niki M. Eloshway

Art Unit

3727

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 May 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-43 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-43 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-16, 18-36 and 38-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schmitz (EP 0,529,383 A2) in view of Hertrampf (U.S. 6,021,912). Schmitz discloses the claimed invention except for the sealing olive. Hertrampf teaches that it is known to provide a closure with a sealing olive (see element 4). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the closure of Schmitz with a sealing olive, as taught by Hertrampf, in order to properly align the closure on the container when being applied thereto.

Schmitz teaches a plastic closure, shown in figures 1 and 2, having a top plate at 2, a substantially cylindrical peripheral portion at 1, and a substantially cylindrical sealing strip at 3. The peripheral portion at 1 has a cylindrical bead at 4, and a screw thread at 1a. The sealing strip extends axially, as shown in figure 1, and engages the outer edge a portion of the outer wall, as shown in figure

2. The weakened annular portion is shown at 9.

3. Claims 17 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schmitz in view of Hertrampf, as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Dai (U.S. 6,044,995). The modified closure of Schmitz discloses the claimed invention except for the tamper band. Dai teaches that it is known to provide a closure with a tamper band (see element 40). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the modified

Art Unit: 3727

closure of Schmitz with a tamper band, as taught by Dai, in order to indicate whether the container has been previously opened.

### ***Response to Arguments***

4. Applicant's arguments filed May 25, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, the motivation to combine is found in knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. As the closure is applied to container the sealing olive aids in guiding and aligning the closure onto the container mouth by receiving the container mouth between the sealing olive and the inside surface of the skirt. Whether or not Hertampf and Schmitz approach the problem of over-pressurization differently, (as argued by Applicant on page 12 of the response filed 5/25/04) does not prevent the use of a sealing olive on the closure of Schmitz. Sealing olives are well known and widely used in the closure art. A sealing olive, such as element 4 of Hertampf, would be useful on the closure of Schmitz even though the closure of Hertampf functions differently than the closure of Schmitz.

5. In response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and

Art Unit: 3727

does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).

6. Applicant argues that the weakened annular portion of Schmitz is “used for a completely different purpose than from the recited invention” (page 13 of the response filed 5/25/04). Claim 1 merely sets forth that the top plate portion has a reduced thickness defining a weakened annular portion. Structurally, the Schmitz closure meets this limitation, regardless of the alleged “different purpose” argued by applicant.

### *Conclusion*

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

8. In order to reduce pendency and avoid potential delays, Technology Center 3700 is encouraging FAXing of responses to Office Actions directly to (703)872-9306. This practice may be used for filing papers not requiring a fee. It may also be used for filing papers which require a fee by applicants who authorize charges to a USPTO deposit account. Please identify the examiner and art unit at the top of your cover sheet. Papers submitted via FAX will be promptly forwarded to the examiner.

Art Unit: 3727

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Niki M. Eloshway whose telephone number is (703) 308-1606. The examiner is in the office on Tuesdays and Fridays. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the 3700 Customer Service Office at (703) 306-5648.



Niki M. Eloshway/nme  
Patent Examiner  
July 2, 2004



LEE YOUNG  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700